Claim 1 has been further amended to delete reference to the distance. The Examiner correctly indicated this distance is in relationship to a time factor. Applicant on the other hand has inserted the limitation in claim 1 that the device does not have a means to mix the sample in the cell. This has also been inserted into the Specification at page 5. However, it does not constitute any new matter. Page 5 references a quiescent solution. Further at page 12 the specification states the Fickian diffusion is the only mode of mass transport i.e., no active mixing. Accordingly Applicant should be entitled to insert these words without a new matter objection.

With that claim change in mind, Applicant would request reconsideration of the rejection over Meyerhoff. Meyerhoff although it does disclose multiple analyte measuring areas on the same cell, it differs from Applicant's invention and is totally unsuitable for miniaturization. Whereas Applicant's invention is particularly designed to be miniaturized i.e., an unexpected advantage of Applicant's invention.

The Meyerhoff reference discloses passing the substrate through a porous support which migrates to the electrode area where it then will react and the reaction product measured. A stirrer is required to continually wash away the enzymatic product. The enzymatic product mixes with a large volume of liquid and in effect is diluted to the point where it does not effect measurement, at least with respect to the sensitivity of the electrode. Thus, the Meyerhoff apparatus requires a large volume of liquid and a mixing apparatus.

Applicant's solution to interference is totally opposite Meyerhoff's. One avoids any mixing by simply taking the measurement rapidly enough to avoid any interference. Mixing would in effect destroy Applicant's measurements.

When Applicant's invention is miniaturized, it simply is a matter of taking the measurement more quickly. The Meyerhoff invention cannot be miniaturized because it requires this large volume of liquid and active mixing to dilute the enzymatic reaction product.

Further, Applicant's new claim 10 recites that the support for the analyte binding area is liquid impervious. Again these exact words are not used in the Specification. However, the example indicates that the support is a polystyrene sheet. Such a sheet is liquid impervious. Further, the structure shown in the drawings teaches that the analyte and substrate are both introduced from the same location. The Meyerhoff invention requires a liquid pervious support for the electrodes.

In light of this, Applicant would maintain that the present invention is certainly new and unobvious in light of the Meyerhoff reference. Although the Meyerhoff reference attempts to measure multianalytes at the same time, it requires mixing and a large volume of diluting fluid in order to eliminate cross-talk. The same mixing suggested by Meyerhoff would absolutely destroy the measurement obtained from Applicant's device. Further, Applicant's invention is uniquely designed for miniaturization whereas the Meyerhoff

product is unsuited for miniaturization. In light of this, Applicant would request reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of same.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS

By: _____
Gregory J. Lunn
Reg. No. 29,945

2700 Carew Tower
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 241-2324
K:\UOC\134A\rspns oa 022900.wpd